UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA LAFAYETTE-OPELOUSAS DIVISION

AKZO-NOBEL, INC., ET AL, * Docket No. 96-2430

Plaintiffs,

VS June 17, 2010

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

ET AL

Defendants. * Lafayette, Louisiana

REPORTER'S OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE MOTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD T. HAIK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

APPEARANCES:

Jeffrey Wertkin Henry Chajet For the Plaintiffs:

Joseph Lemoine

For the Defendant: David M. Glass

Katherine Vincent

Mary Thompson, RMR, FCRR REPORTED BY:

800 Lafayette Street, Ste. 3105 Lafayette, Louisiana 70501 (337)593-5222

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Let's start with *Methane Awareness*.

The first is a motion to reopen and next is a motion for contempt.

Who filed the motion to reopen?

MR. LEMOINE: I did, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Granted. Have a seat.

Who filed the motion for contempt?

MR. LEMOINE: (Indicating.)

THE COURT: Now you can stand.

MR. LEMOINE: I did that, too, Your Honor. And do you want appearances or --

THE COURT: Yeah, let's do the appearances.

MR. LEMOINE: All right. Joe Lemoine. And I would like to introduce the Court to Mr. Henry Chajet and Mr. Jeffrey Werkin, co-counsel representing the plaintiffs also, and this is Mr. Lonny Badeaux.

THE COURT: Is he co-counsel also?

MR. LEMOINE: No, sir. He is representing the plaintiffs -- well, he is a plaintiff, actually, Your Honor.

And with the Court's permission I would like for Mr. Henry Chajet to make plaintiffs' argument.

THE COURT: All right. I've heard Mr. Badeaux argue a lot of times. I thought you would have Mr. Badeaux argue.

1 MR. LEMOINE: He'd do a good job. 2 THE COURT: Probably better than the lawyers in 3 this case. 4 MR. LEMOINE: I'm not going to argue that. 5 MR. CHAJET: Good morning, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Morning. 7 MR. CHAJET: Thank you for --8 THE COURT: Do y'all have any objection to opening 9 this matter because I'm going to open it? 10 MR. GLASS: No, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Good. 12 MR. CHAJET: Thank you, Your Honor, for hearing 13 this matter this morning. 14 The facts in this case are not in dispute. The 15 case goes back to --16 THE COURT: I'm very familiar with this case. 17 isn't your first time here -- it may be your first time here. 18 MR. CHAJET: No, I was here, too. In fact, we were 19 in the old courthouse. 20 THE COURT: That's right. It's been so long. 21 MR. CHAJET: Last time we were here, you had just 22 moved in here and you were working on getting furniture. 23 It's been a long time. 24 And the case we thought was resolved when you 25 issued an order providing a remedy as advised by the Circuit

Court of Appeals. 1 2 THE COURT: Let me hear from the other side. 3 understand your argument. I've read your memo. The bottom 4 line is you want me to hold them in contempt because you said 5 they didn't comply with the order. 6 MR. CHAJET: We want them to follow the order, 7 Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Okay. 9 MR. CHAJET: Thank you. 10 THE COURT: You're welcome. 11 MR. GLASS: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm David 12 Glass from the Civil Division of the Justice Department in 13 Washington. And with me is Katy Vincent from the U.S. 14 Attorney's Office. 15 THE COURT: I know Ms. Vincent. 16 MR. GLASS: I'm sure you know her. And also 17 DeKeely Hartsfield from the National Institute of 18 Occupational Safety & Health in Atlanta. 19 THE COURT: Welcome to Louisiana where the oil is 20 underground and now also in the Gulf of Mexico. 21 MR. GLASS: In the water. 22 Your Honor, I am a newcomer to this case, but as a 23 newcomer let me tell you what my perception is. 24 perception is that plaintiffs have never liked the study that 25 NIOSH and NCI have been working on all these years and

they've been trying to put the kibosh on it from the beginning. And they don't know what the study is going to say, but they know they don't like it. And now the study is almost over and they're going to take one more shot at stifling it.

And what they want is they want to have the chance to review the papers that set forth the results of the study and to comment on them before anybody else gets that right.

THE COURT: Well, I told them they had that right to do that. You weren't here.

MR. GLASS: I wasn't here, but we don't view anything that happened in this case or in the Court's order as giving them that exclusive right.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GLASS: What happened --

THE COURT: Well, let me make it clear. Okay?

I required y'all to provide them with a copy of all the documents submitted to the committee in compliance with this order. Okay? What I didn't do, unfortunately, was watch the detail on some of this. I don't just blame myself for that -- although I do, but, you know, nobody else picked it up either, that we should have had something extremely detailed so that everybody can be on the same page.

MR. GLASS: Well --

THE COURT: So I think they're right although I

don't think that you're in contempt.

MR. GLASS: Well, let me see if I can explain just a little bit.

The Fifth Circuit said that these plaintiffs had a compelling interest in making sure that the study was done properly and came out right, and we don't disagree that they have a compelling interest, but we --

THE COURT: I hope you don't because the Fifth Circuit tells me what to do.

MR. GLASS: Sure. Exactly. But the point is they're not the only folks that have that compelling interest. The miners --

THE COURT: But they're the only folks that are here in court with us.

MR. GLASS: They are the only ones who are here, but the miners certainly have that same interest and so do the mine owners, and these folks don't represent all the mine owners. So we made a proposition to these folks --

THE COURT: No, but they represent the mine workers who are down there inhaling the diesel fumes, and that's what this is all about.

MR. GLASS: But the unions represent them, too.

So let me tell you the proposition that we made to these folks which was when the 90-day review period for Congress expired -- and it expired on June 1st -- we proposed

to them we'll give you the final draft of these papers, we'll give them to the miners, we'll give them to the mine owners, and we asked them if they objected to that because we didn't want to do it if they objected to it because they would have filed another contempt motion. And they never gave us the go ahead to do that. We were perfectly willing to do that and they didn't let us go ahead with it.

We viewed the 90 days as a 90-day review period for Congress because that's what the Fifth Circuit said. And after all, that provision of the order went into the order in the second time -- the second iteration of the order after the provision was in there telling us to give the stuff to plaintiffs.

We have no objection to giving it to plaintiffs. It's giving it to plaintiffs exclusively. That is the problem.

THE COURT: It's giving it to plaintiffs when.

MR. GLASS: We'll give it to the plaintiffs --

THE COURT: That's the problem.

MR. GLASS: We'll give it to the plaintiffs at the end of the 90-day period for the congressional review. We'll give it to them, we'll give it to the union, we'll give it to the mine owners.

THE COURT: Does that give them time to do what they have to do?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GLASS: I don't know what they have to do, but it's not clear to us why they should have a right to comment on this above and beyond --THE COURT: Because the Court said they did. so did the Fifth Circuit. It wasn't just me, it was them, too. MR. GLASS: But the Fifth Circuit never said they had the exclusive right to comment and to review --THE COURT: Nobody said they had the exclusive right. MR. GLASS: Well, okay. But if we give the papers to them before we give them to everybody else, then that gives them an exclusive right. THE COURT: Well, then publish it. What are you trying to hide? MR. GLASS: That's what we're planning to do. THE COURT: No, no, no. Publish what you're doing. MR. GLASS: That's exactly what we want to do. We have an academic journal lined up, a part of the Oxford University Press, to publish this. This is what we want to do. We want to get this thing out in the open to everybody so that everybody can take shots at it. THE COURT: Okay. Let's do this. How soon can you get that report to the plaintiffs? MR. GLASS: We can get it as soon as I get back to

Washington.

THE COURT: Okay. So 48 hours?

MR. GLASS: Sure. Sure.

THE COURT: Does that make y'all happy or unhappy?

I'm not going to hold them in contempt because there is some language in here that I can see where they're coming from. But I want to give you what you want.

MR. CHAJET: Your Honor, we would happily accept delivery within 48 hours.

We would like the 90 days to review it before they -- part of the rationale in your decision and in the Fifth Circuit's decision was if there are inaccuracies, if there are biases that we could point out, we should bring those to the attention of HHS and the congressional committee, and we would like that opportunity. The 90 days is not going to do anything to harm them, and it seems like the only remedy that we have that is real is to have a look at it.

THE COURT: I think you're right.

MR. GLASS: Your Honor, why should they have this exclusive right beyond --

THE COURT: It's not exclusive. You're making it exclusive. You provide it to them so they can review it, and they can go ahead -- maybe they have some good points. I think everybody -- don't y'all want to protect the people

1 working in those mines? 2 MR. GLASS: That's why we're doing the study. 3 THE COURT: And so do they. It's better to have 4 two or three or four or five people looking at all this stuff 5 and making some decisions. What is your objection to having 6 them look at it? 7 MR. GLASS: The objection is giving them the 8 exclusive right. If we can publish it -- if we can publish 9 it and get it out to the public as soon as we possibly can, 10 that's what we want to do. 11 THE COURT: Who is preventing you from publishing 12 it and getting it out to the public? 13 Well, that's what this motion is about. MR. GLASS: 14 THE COURT: Well, wait, listen to me. They want it 15 before the committee rules on it. They want it before it is 16 provided to the committee. 17 Have y'all provided it to the committee? 18 MR. GLASS: We provided it to the committee. 19 THE COURT: So they want a right to be able to 20 address the committee, and they haven't had the opportunity 21 to see it yet. Correct? 22 MR. GLASS: That's correct. 23 THE COURT: All right. If you want to do all of 24 this thing in the sunlight and the sunshine of everybody 25 seeing and knowing, then give it to them, publish it, do

1 whatever you want, and then 90 days later have the 2 committee -- or ask the committee to review it. I mean, I 3 don't know the procedure for all of this stuff. 4 MR. GLASS: What we --5 THE COURT: It seems like we're just playing games 6 here. 7 MR. GLASS: What happens is that this is a 8 scientific study and what you're supposed to do with 9 scientific studies -- the Office of Management and Budget has 10 ordered us to do this -- you send it out for peer review. 11 THE COURT: I understand. 12 MR. GLASS: What you do is you send it to an 13 academic journal and they take care of the peer review. 14 After the peer review is done, then we give it to 15 Congress. That's the final draft of the study. We figure 16 that Congress doesn't want to look at a preliminary draft, 17 they can look at the final draft. That's what we have given 18 them. 19 THE COURT: What you have, though, are miners down 20 inside the mine who may be able to read -- I know Mr. Badeaux 21 can read. He is a pretty smart guy. Okay? These people 22 know -- they -- they have a stake more than the stake that 23 you have because they're down in the trenches so to speak. 24 MR. GLASS: Sure. 25 THE COURT: Not in the trenches, but down in the

1 mine. This is deeper than a trench. 2 MR. GLASS: Exactly. 3 THE COURT: People have died down there on 4 occasion. 5 MR. GLASS: That's exactly why we want to give this 6 to everybody. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Then give it to them right now, 8 and I'm going to order you can't publish it or do anything 9 else for 90 days. 10 Is that what you want? MR. CHAJET: Yes, Your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: So ordered. Provide me with an order 13 and do that. 14 And then I'm going to close this thing again after 15 that so we don't keep doing it. 16 MR. GLASS: Thank you. 17 THE COURT: If what you want to do is let them look 18 at it, then let them look at it. Give them an opportunity to 19 evaluate it. 20 I don't know what you're afraid of. Why are you 21 afraid of them looking at it and making suggestions? 22 MR. GLASS: We're not afraid of anybody. We want 23 everybody to have an equal chance. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Then everybody will have an 25 equal chance at the proper time.

MR. LEMOINE: Thank you. MR. CHAJET: Thank you, Your Honor. (Proceedings adjourned.) CERTIFICATE I hereby certify this 18th day of June, 2010, that the foregoing is, to the best of my ability and understanding, a true and correct transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter. S/Mary V. Thompson Official Court Reporter